92-806

FILED
JUN 8 1992
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

CASE NO. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1991

JAMES H. & ROSA ANN COSSETT PRO SE;

PETITIONERS;

-VS-

THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY ET AL;

DEFENDANTS.

ON AN APPEAL FROM "THE STATE" SECULAR HUMANIST GOVERNMENT CONTROLLED "NEW IDEA" RELIGION AND FROM THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE S.DIS. OF OHIO W. DIV. AT DAYTON AND FROM THE U.S. SIXTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AT CINCINNATI, OHIO.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

PETITIONERS ARE PROCEEDING PRO SE.

RECEIVED
JUN 1992
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

JAMES H.& ROSA ANN
COSSETT PRO SE
P.O. BOX 191
BOWERSVILLE, OHIO 45307

TELEPHONE NO. (513)
453-2432

22 pp

(A) QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

(1) With what right was the American Flag "DESECRATED"..."to establish new federal judicial positions and for other purposes" as a religion?

(2) Did the Judicial Branch of our "PERFECT UNION" withdraw from the Union "to establish new federal judicial positions and for other purposes" consider itself a "NEW IDEA" secular humanist religion of a supreme government controlled second republic, without respect to one nation and one republic "UNDER GOD"?

(3) In July of 1984, while Gregory Lee Johnson "DESECRATED" our Flag [juxtaposition] side-by-side the passing of "The Federal Judgeship Act of 1984", was the intended message to covertly ordain and establish judgeships by symbolizing a "primitive way of communicating" a "NEW IDEA" religion, controlling both Church and State?

(4) Justice Stevens, in your opinion, on July 10, 1984, did President Reagan, and others, give respect to the fact that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion?

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW (CONT.)

(5) Were the "OTHER PROPOSITIONS" that were implicated by you, Justice Stevens, in the case of [TEXAS -VS- JOHNSON] full text of opinion 6-20-89 related "to establish new federal judicial positions", why Johnson "DESECRATED" our Flag for profit?

(6) Was the bias and prejudice reason for "DESECRATING" our Flag, a covert trick to trick certain members of Congress into amending our BILL OF RIGHTS from its original rock solid supreme December 15, 1791 date to establish "The Federal Judgeship Act of 1984" as a more supreme religious power in order to overrule freedom of religion?

(7) Is the "AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES" contained in P.L. 98-353 a well planned expert revolution to overrule freedom of religion and other rights retained thereof?

(8) Did the District Court abridge First Amendment rights to freedom of religion by overruling Cossetts' objections to governmental controlled religion and conditions of servitude?

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW (CONT.)

(9) Does our DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE and BILL OF RIGHTS still hold their supreme position for we the people to demand?

(10) With what right can mock trials be held to avoid punishment for unlawfully holding the office of judge, while judges re-establish each other as a "NEW IDEA" religion? (SEE) [THE STATE, EX REL. SCHENCK -VS- SHATTUCK (1982), OHIO ST 3d 272] mock trial, pages one and two.

(11) With what right can "THE STATE" bring action against THE PEOPLE, to establish "NEW IDEA" judicial positions as a religion, holding all power to themselves, by themselves for the State and without "an impartial jury of the State?"

(12) Is "DESECRATION" CROSS BURNING respecting the establishment of religion or to establish "new federal judicial positions" as a religion in the case of [R.A.V. -VS- MINNESOTA] Case No. 90-7675?

(B) LIST OF PARTIES

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES GEORGE H.W. BUSH; THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY; JOSEPH R. BIDEN JR. (U.S. SENATE); JACK BROOKS (U.S. HOUSE OF REP.); GERALD P. SUMMERS (FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD); D. MICHAEL CRITES (U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO); WILLIAM A. CLARK; HERMAN J. WEBER; MICHAEL DEWINE; GEORGE W. LEDFORD; JAMES A.RHODES; THE STATE OF OHIO; RICHARD CELEST; JUDSON L. SHATTUCK JR.; WILLIAM A.SCHENCK; DAVID L. HOBSON; JOSEPH E. HAINS; THE NOW CLOSED MERCHANTS & MECHANICS FEDERAL SAVING & LOAN ASSOCIATION; PAST VICE PRESIDENT- WAYNE SPAHR;MARY McCORMICK; JEROME M. STROZDAS; GREGORY LEE JOHNSON.

THE RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION
25 northwest point blvd.
ELK GROVE VILLAGE, IL 60009

"THE STATE NEW IDEA" GOVERNMENTAL CONTROLLED RELIGION.
(P.L. 98-353)
MICHAEL R. MERZ
CLARENCE THOMAS
DAVID SOUTER

LIST OF PARTIES (CONT.)

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES DANFORTH J. QUALE; THE RESOLUTION TRUST CORP. (ATTORNEY) DIANNA M. SALVA; JOHN BUTZ; MARGARET E. WHITTNER; JOSEPH T. CAMPBELL; THOMAS J. O'CONNELL; CHARLES TIEFER; RUGGERO J.ALDISERT; JAMES A. RATTAN; CALVIE W. BARE; HOWELL HEFLIN; JOHN T. COPENHAVER JR. ROBERT FOSTER; ASA S. HERZOG; HERBERT KATZ; RICHARD LEVINE; BERYL E. Mc/GUIRE; NORMAN H. NACHMAN; ALEXANDER L. PASKEY; JOSEPH PATCHAM; MOREY L. SEAR; LERENCE P. KING; WALTER J. TEGGART; RONALD W. REGAN; STROM THURMOND; PETER W. REDINO JR. JOSEPH F. SPANIOL JR.; EDWARD T. GIGNOUX.

OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL
LEE FISHER

SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
KENNETH W. STARR
ROOM 5143 DEPT. OF JUSTICE
WASHINGTON D.C. 20530

(C) TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE
(A) QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW	i-ii-iii
(B) LIST OF PARTIES	iv-v
(C) TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
(D) OPINIONS BELOW	1-2-
(E) GROUNDS TO INVOKE JURISDICTION..	3-4-5-
(F) CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY DECLARATION OF PROVISIONS INVOLVED	6-7-
(G) STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	8-9-10-11-12-
(H) ARGUMENT	13-14-15-
(I) CONCLUSION AND DEMANDS FOR RELIEF	16-17-18
JOINT APPENDIX "A"	
MARCH 31,1992 ORDER APPEALED FROM	
JOINT APPENDIX "B"	APP. 1 threw 15

(D) OPINIONS BELOW

The Opinion, Sanctions, and Entry overruling "FREEDOM OF RELIGION" by the U.S. District Court are set out in Appendix "A"&"B" 1-15. On March 31,1992 the court of Appeals said "NO JUDGE OF THIS COURT HAVING REQUESTED A VOTE ON THE SUGGESTION FOR REHEARING EN-BANC, THE PETITION FOR REHEARING HAS BEEN REFERRED TO THE ORIGINAL PANEL". Accordingly,the Petition is denied.

MOCK TRIAL NO.1

[STATE OF OHIO EX REL, SCHENCK -VS- SHATTUCK]

SHATTUCK WAS OUSTED FROM OFFICE

FOOT NOTE: The above MOCK TRIAL action was brought to establish "THE STATE", judicial "NEW IDEA" religion & to avoid punishment for unlawfully holding office of judge as "NEW IDEA" secular humanist religion. DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT was OUSTED from office in the name of "WE THE PEOPLE" only to set the stage for "THE STATE" TO OVERRULE THE CHURCH & WE THE PEOPLE On April 23,1982, James A. Rhodes, Governor, reported his own choice of appointee to be prosecuted for unlawfully holding the office of judge.

OPINIONS BELOW (CONT.)

MOCK TRIAL NO.2 [THE STATE -VS- THE CHURCH] [CITE AS STATE, EX REL, SCHENCK -VS- SHATTUCK JR. (1982), OHIO ST. 3d 272] Sept. 15,1982; William F. Schenck Pro Se in fact joined the Ohio Supreme Court and THE STATE "NEW IDEA" RELIGION to establish state controll over the Church and for other purposes omitted an impartial jury of the state. The "NEW IDEA" STATE CONTROLLED SECOND RELIGION IS THE LARGEST CONSPIRACY IN THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; while in JulY OF 1984, the Judicial Conference of the 'NEW IDEA" state religion "DESECRATED" our American Flag "TO ESTABLISH NEW FEDERAL JUDICIAL POSITIONS"AS A NEW IDEA RELIGION UNDER GOVERNMENT CONTROL.

MOCK TRIAL NO.3 [TEXAS -VS- JOHNSON]

In the United States Supreme Court, Gregory Lee Johnson was granted the right to "DESECRATE" our American Flag to divest and divert the June 20/21, 1989 SACRED CHARACTER of our Flag. Action taken on June 12,1990 to correct this injustice in the U.S. District COURT.

(E) GROUNDS TO INVOKE JURISDICTION

This is a civil action for freedom of religion to protect and defend our Flag & Cross from "DESECRATION" .."TO ESTABLISH NEW FEDERAL JUDICIAL POSITIONS as a "NEW IDEA" SECOND GOVERNMENT CONTROLLED RELIGION. The grounds to invoke the jurisdiction of this High Court is found in our "BILL OF RIGHTS" First Amendment FREE EXERCISE THEREOF "TO PETITION THE GOVERNMENT FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCE" without having our petition answered only with repeated injury and sanctions. Moreover, we the Petitoners, are vested with power retained in our Declaration of Independence, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter it and re-establish one nation and one republic "UNDER GOD" . The most important grounds to invoke the jurisdiction of this Court is, THE HOLY BIBLE AS A TABLE OF AUTHORITY TO HOLD PUBLIC OFFICE.

JURISDICTION (CONT.)

(i) On Dec. 6,1984, Petitioners (Cossetts) WERE SUMMONED into the Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Ohio Western Div. at Dayton, under jurisdiction of P.L. 98-353 USC TITLE 11 § 1334 Act of Congress to COVERTLY anend our BILL OF RIGHTS and for other purposes as a second government controlled "NEW IDEA" religion controlling both the CHURCH & STATE. The Magistrate (so called "JUDGE") of the U.S. District Court for the S. DIS. OF OHIO has the same interlocking religious power as the Bankruptcy Court but not exclusive jurisdiction arising under TITLE 11, notwithstanding any act of Congress to covertly amend our BILL OF RIGHTS on the FLAG BURNING ISSUE.

(ii) The District Court for the S. DIS. OF OHIO W. DIV. AT DAYTON, on Aug. 30,1991, Case No. C-3-90-183 DOC.#58 ; Judge Walter Rice STRUCK DOWN the core of our First Amendment rights by OVERRULING freedom of religion as not clearly an abuse of the law.

JURISDICTION (CONT.)

(iii) On March 31,1992, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit had the same second government controlled religion position of power under P.L 98-353 and granted sanctions to Judson L. Shattuck Jr. to double his cost of this action.

(iv) On May 18,1992 The En-Banc Court of Appeals said "NO JUDGE OF THIS COURT HAVING REQUESTED A VOTE ON THE SUGGESTION FOR RE-HEARING EN-BANC. Accordingly the Petition is denied.

(v) On June 20,1989, the U.S. Supreme Court retained exclusive jurisdiction in [TEXAS -VS- JOHNSON] The Court said "THE OUTCOME CAN BE LAID AT NO DOOR BUT OURS." I DO NOT BELIEVE THE CONSTITUTION GIVES US THE RIGHT TO RULE" (Justice Kennedy, JUNE 20/21,1989).

THIS CASE IS OF IMPERATIVE PUBLIC IMPORTANCE TO ALL WHO BELIEVE IN GOD., OUR FLAG AND CROSS.

(F) CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY DECLARATION OF PROVISIONS INVOLVED IN CONGRESS JULY 4,1776 DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE BILL OF RIGHTS DECEMBER 15,1791

AMENDMENT 1: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibit the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for redress of grievance.

AMENDMENT 2: A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

AMENDMENT 3: No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

AMENDMENT 4: The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things seized.

AMENDMENT 5: No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY DECLARATION
OF PROVISIONS INVOLVED (CONT.)

AMENDMENT 6: In all criminal prosecution, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the state and district werein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witness against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defence.

AMENDMENT 7: In suits at common law, were the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no FACT tried by a jury shall be otherwise re-examined in any court of the united states, than according to the rules of the common law.

AMENDMENT 8: Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishment inflicted.

AMENDMENT 9: The enumeration in the constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

AMENDMENT 10: The power not delegated to the United States Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the state, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.

WHEN IN THE COURSE OF HUMAN EVENTS, it becomes necessary for ONE PEOPLE to dissolve the political bands wich have connected them with another," GOVERNMENTAL SECULAR HUMANIST CONTROLLED RELIGION THAT IS CONTRAY TO OUR FAITH IN GOD, IT IS THE DUTY OF ONE PEOPLE TO ABOLISH SUCH UNJUST POWER.

IN CONGRESS JULY 4,1776

AND IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

JULY 8,1992

(G) STATEMENT OF THE CASE

(1) This Case originated EX-PARTE "IN THE STATE' secular humanist government controlled "NEW IDEA" RELIGION, Greene County,Ohio. [M&M BANK -VS- COSSETTS] to EMBEZZLE FROM THE **ESTATE** OF JAMES H. & ROSA ANN COSSETT.

(2) On June 12,1990 in the U.S. DISTRICT Court at Dayton, Ohio, ACTION to prevent the "DESECRATION" of our American Flag was taken within the time limit of the law by James H. & Rosa Ann Cossett. On December 26,1990 Case No. C-3-90-183 "Judge" Magistrate Michael R. Merz, without the consent of the Governed, imposed sanctions of $1,211.25 against Petitioners James H.& Rosa Ann Cossett for raising the FLAG BURNING ISSUE in a court of law as a meanes to protect our American Flag from being"DESECRATED"

(3) On January 31,1991 the U.S. District Court ordered "THE CAPTIONED CAUSE IS HEREBY TERMINATED UPON THE DOCKET RECORD OF THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT." Sanction order upheld as not clearly erroneous, contrary to law or abuse of discretion.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE (CONT.)

(4) On July 9,1991 Magistrate Merz, in the U.S. District Court, reopened Case No. C-3-183 on the FLAG BURNING ISSUE, on the grounds that the term period for P.L. 98-353 would expire on July 10,1991.

(5) On July 10,1991, again without the consent of the governed, Magistrate Merz intervened and said .."the Plaintiffs are agian cautioned against filings which have no relationship to the real world." (SEE APP.-4-)

(6) On July 23,1991, Petitioners rights to a fair trial by jury was denied. (SEE APP. -2-)

FOOT NOTE: LIST OF CASES THAT HAVE BEEN PROSECUTED IN THE NAME OF "THE STATE" TO ESTABLISH GOVERNMENT CONTROLLED "NEW IDEA" SECULAR HUMANIST RELIGION.

(i) On Sept.8,1982 after being ousted from office, Judson L. Shattuck Jr. expressed his new idea government controlled religious position by conducting an ex-parte mock trial in the case of [M&M BANK -VS- COSSETTS]. This mock trial was to cover-up embezzlement at the now closed Merchants & Mechanics Federal Savings & Loan Association.

(ii) On Sept. 15,1982, the Ohio Supreme Court aforementioned mock trial also interlocked to confirm ex-parte [M&M BANK -VS- COSSETTS] unconstitutional order of judgement by Judson L. Shattuck Jr. to show favor to bank embezzlers.

(iii) On Dec. 6,1984, under P.L. 98-353, the Federal Judgeship Act of 1984, the M&M BANK Summoned Cossetts

FOOT NOTE (CONT.)

into the "NEW IDEA" government controlled religion Bankruptcy Court to enforce their ex-parte mock trial Judgement by Judson L. Shattuck Jr., while in the "NEW IDEA" GOVERNMENT CONTROLLED RELIGION BANKRUPTCY COURT before William A. Clark, SELF-APPOINTED trustee GEORGE W. LEDFORD STOLD $31, 920.91 FROM THE ESTATE OF JAMES H. & ROSA ANN COSSETT.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE (CONT.)

(6) On July 22,1991, Cossetts filed an Appeal to the U.S. SUPREME COURT to protect our Flag from harms way. In the U.S. District Court on July 23,1991, our Appeal was struck down by Magistrate (JUDGE) MERZ (SEE APP.-3-)

(7) On August 30,1991, the U.S. District Court STRUCK DOWN FREEDOM OF RELIGION (SEE APP. -7-)

(8) On Sept. 19,1991, James H. Cossett and ROSA ANN COSSETT filed a 'NOTICE OF APPEAL" in the U.S. DISTRICT COURT to appeal to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals (Case No. 91-3926)

(9) On May 18,1992, the U.S. Court of Appeals said "NO JUDGE OF THIS COURT HAVING REQUESTED TO VOTE ON THE SUGGESTION FOR RE-HEARING EN-BANC." Accordingly, the petition is denied.

(10) On May 26,1992, Petitioners Moved the Court for a stay of MANDATE to honer the SEPARATION OF CHURCH & STATE, "DENIED" -10-

STATEMENT OF THE CASE (CONT.)

(11) WHILE THE MANDATE FOR THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH & STATE WAS DENIED JUNE 8,1992 THE COURT ALSO ACCORDINGLY, IMPOSED SANCTIONS OF DOUBLE COST AND ATTORNEY FEES, TO RE-ESTABLISH THEIR MARCH 31,1992 ENTERY BY THE ORDER OF THE COURT.

/ S /

LEONARD GREEN CLERK

THE SIXTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS HAS BEEN DEAD LOCKED IN ORDER TO STALL THIS CASE.

OUR WRIT OF CERTIORARI HAS BEEN FILED IN TIME TO COVER ALL STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.

SO HELP US GOD,

IN GOD WE TRUST.

JULY 8,1992

STATEMENT OF THE CASE (CONT.)

(SEE APP. -5-&-6-)

FULL TEXT OF OPINION

CASE NO. 88-155

[TEXAS, PETITIONER V GREGORY LEE JOHNSON]

SYLLABUS

ARGUED MARCH 21,1989

DECIDED JUNE 20/21, 1989

"DESECRATION OF OUR AMERICAN FLAG (SIDE-BY-SIDE) "TO ESTABLISH NEW FEDERAL JUDICIAL POSITIONS" AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES AS A "NEW IDEA" GOVERNMENT CONTROLLED RELIGION TO "OVERRULE" THE FREE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. THIS CASE PRECEDENCE IS OF THE MOST DANGER TO ALL AMERICANS WHO HONER GOD AND NOT THE NEW IDEA GOVERNMENT CONTROLLED RELIGION. WE WILL NOT REST UNTIL THIS MOCKERY OF JUSTICE IS CORRECTED.

(H) ARGUMENT

WE CONTEMPLATE WITH SOLEMN RESPECT TO REVE-RANCE THAT OUR FATHER WHO ART IN HEAVEN IS THE FOUNDING FATHER OF OUR "BILL OF RIGHTS" & HAS ESTABLISHED "A WALL OF SEPARATION BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE." HENCE WHILE OUR AMERICAN FLAG WAS "DESECRATED" TO BURN DOWN SAID WALL OF SEPARATION, DURING THE REPUBLICAN PARTY NATIONAL CONVENTION. ACCORDINGLY BY FREE EXERCISE THEREOF: "UNDER GOD" THE DEMOCRAT PARTY DID BATTLE WITH PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH AND HIS PARTY BEFORE THE FULL U.S. CONGRESS,TO PREVENT CONGRESS FROM AMENDING SAID RIGHTS ORIGINAL SACRED SUPREME POSITION OF POWER FOR "ONE PEOPLE" UNDER NATURE'S GOD, WHO FIRST GAVE RESPECT TO THE EXISTENCE OF GOD BEFORE OUR FLAG "RESPECTING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION". THE DEMOCRAT PARTY HAS WON THE BATTLE FOR A SEPARATION BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE, IT IS NOW TIME FOR "ONE PEOPLE" TO WIN THE WAR IN THE U. S. SUPREME COURT,JULY 4,1992 OUR DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE FROM THE "NEW WORLD ORDER" OF KING GEORGE AND HIS MAGISTRATES.

History repeats itself. In the old country, the king held "MOCK TRIALS" to avoid punishment for religious crimes committed against "ONE PEOPLE". The same kind of "MOCK TRIALS & religious crimes committed and are in the opinion section threw out this writ.

"OUR FLAG" WAS BURNED (1) "AS AN EXPRESSION OF FREEDOM" AND (2) "DESECRATED" !!!! "DURING THE REPUBLICAN".. PARTY.. "NATIONAL CONVENTION" We will now show that [FREE EXPRESSION -VS- DESECRATION] are as different as oil and water; they simply DO NOT MIX . "DESECRATION meanes (1) TO DIVEST AND (2) TO DIVERT. Our AMERICAN FLAG WAS "DESECRATED" TO "DIVEST" OF SACRED CHARACTER TO BURN DOWN "A WALL OF SEPARATION BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE" The general public was "DIVERTED" into believing that our Flag was burned by "FREE EXERCISE THEREOF" and that our Bill of Rights was in bad need of "AMENDING" on the issue of Flag burning. THIS WAS THE START OF A RELIGIOUS WAR BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE. [REPUBLICAN -V- DEMOCRAT]

Under the circumstances of this case, there is NO separation of Church and State. The State has ESTABLISHED itself by "FREE EXERCISE THEREOF" AS A RELIGION controlling both the Church and State, that permits Flag & Cross burning that has oppressed and dictated conditions of UN-JUST servitude upon petitioners of cruel and unusual punishment and sanctions, because we will not honer the "NEW IDEA" secular humanist Government controlled religion. such conditions are denying due process of law. FREEDOM: by common law interpretation demands respect, it is time to give respect to GOD, RESPECTING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION. THE COURT OF APPEALS interlocked with the so called magistrate JUDGE THAT SHOCKED THE CONSCIENCES OF A GODLY SOCIETY, that did in fact intimidate, oppress, and ignor a valid claim for relief, The magistrate ORDERS WERE AFFIRMED. OVERRULING PETITIONERS OBJECTION TO GOVERNMENTAL CONTROLLED SECULAR HUMANIST "NEW IDEA" RELIGION. OUR VALID CLAIM FOR RELIEF HAS ALWAYS BEEN PICTURE PERFECT, FREEDOM OF RELIGION

(I) CONCLUSION AND DEMANDS FOR RELIEF

Once again we state, history repeats itself. The founding fathers fled the old country to be free from the oppression of the establishment of government controlled religion and conditions of servitude. The same kind of government second religion being established by the unnecessary "DESECRATION" of our flag to recall the mandate separation of Church & State MUST BE REVERSED.WE, "ONE PEOPLE" DEMAND FREEDOM OF RELIGION. The U.S. SUPREME COURT AND OTHERS must stop intervening into exclusive jurisdiction that belongs to GOD ALL MIGHTY and revert back to the separation of Church and State.

FURTHER ; relief is sought to issue an ORDER to the Resolution Trust Corp. to pay double "PROOF OF CLAIM" of James H. & Rosa Ann Cossett, NOW PENDING. AS A CIVILIZED GODLY SOCIETY RESPECTING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION REQUEST THAT OUR PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SIXTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS BE GRANTED TO REVIEW & PROPERLY RULED THIS CASE FOR THE FURTHERANCE OF JUSTICE AND THE PRESERVATION OF FREEDOM, LIBERTY

CONCLUSION AND DEMANDS FOR RELIEF (CONT.)

Further, Petitioners demand relief from judgements from Judson L. Shattuck, Jr. Michael R. Merz, William A. Clark, David Souter, Clarence Thomas, and all others who hold office under P. L. 98-353, the "NEW IDEA" GOVERNMENT CONTROLLED SECULAR HUMANIST FORM OF RELIGION, THAT IS FOREIGN to the character of our Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights, We the Petitioners, due to such anomalies by the Courts below & others that affront the consciences of a GODLY civilized society, respectfully demand that our petition for writ of certiorari to be granted to review and properly rule this Case for the furtherance of justice and the preservation of our BILL OF RIGHTS AND A SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE. ACCORDINGLY, an affidavit of bias and prejudice has been filed by we the Petitioners AND HEREIN IS MADE A PART OF THE WRIT.

Congress has passed P.L 98-353 "THE FEDERAL JUDGESHIP ACT OF 1984" That has "OVERRULED" Freedom of Religion and our Bill of Rights.

CONCLUSION AND DEMANDS FOR RELIEF (CONT.)

We will move to repeal P.L. 98-353. It is our PRAYER TO GOD ALL MIGHTY that this Court will find our Flag and, moreover, all American symbols to be worthy of respect and protection from 'DESECRATION", this 8th day of our LORD, July 1992

Respectfully, TO GOD

James H. Cossett

James H. Cossett, Pro Se
Petitioner

Rosa Ann Cossett

Rosa Ann Cossett, Pro Se
Petitioner

P.O. Box 191
Bowersville, Ohio 45307
(513) 453-2432

FOOT NOTE:
"THE DISTRICT'S ORDER IS AFFIRMED. RULE 9(b)(3) 6th Cir. R."
BY O-R-D-E-R of the CLERK.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

COSSETT	)	CASE NO. 91-3926
	)	O-R-D-E-R
VS	)	
	)	APPEALED FROM 3-31-92
THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY	)	
	)	F-I-N-A-L
		O-R-D-E-R 6-8-92

UPON CONSIDERATION OF APPELLAN'S MOTION TO STAY THE MANDATE, IT IS ORDERED THAT THE MOTION BE, AND HEREBY IS, DENIED.

MAY 1,1992 FILED & ORDERED BY THE CLERK,

IT APPEARING TO THE COURT THAT THE MANDATE WAS INADVERTENTLY ISSUED ON APRIL 24,1992 FOR THE ABOVE-STYLED APPEAL, IT IS ORDERED THAT THE MANDATE IS HEREBY RECALLED AND THE CASE IS RE-STORED TO THE ACTIVE DOCKET.

/S/

LENARD GREEN, CLERK

ENTERED PURSUANT TO RULE 8 (b) RULE OF THE SIXTH CIRCUIT.

Foot Note:

FURTHER SEE SUPPLEMENTAL WRIT OF CERTIORARI APPENDIX 1-2- & -3-

(APPENDIX "A")

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

I, Leonard Green, Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true & correct copy of Joint Appendix in the case of

Cossett

VS.

The Federal Judiciary et al.

No. 91-3926, AS THE SAME REMAINS UPON THE FILE and record of said United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of whole thereof.

IN TESTIMONY WEREOF, I have hereunto subscribe my hand and affixed the seal of said court at the City of Cincinnati, Ohio this 30th day of June, A.D. 1992

/S/

LONARD GREEN, CLERK

SEAL FOR THE
SIXTH CIRCUIT

* BY: Michelle Charles
Depuity Clerk

CASE NO. 91-3926

FILE STAMPED

11-4-91

LEONARD GREEN, CLERK

JOINT APPENDIX

B

COSSETT -VS- THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY ET AL.

JOINT APPENDIX ONE THREW FIFTEEN

AS CERTIFIED TO BE
ON THE DOCKET OF THE
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

COSSETT	)	CASE NO. C-3-90-183
-VS-	)	NOTICE OF APPEAL
The Federal Judiciary	)	

NOTICE IS HERE BY GIVEN COSSETT'S APPEAL TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT ON AN APPEAL FROM THE MAGISTRATE SECOND RIGHT JUDGE, IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WEST DIVISION AT DAYTON. NOTICE RECIEVED JULY 22, 1991 AND STRUCK DOWn JULY 23,1991

JAMES H. COSSETT

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON

COSSETTS PLAINTIFFS -VS- THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY DEFENDANTS	CASE NO. C-3-90-183 MOTION TO ABSTAIN & JURY DEMANDS

NOW COME JAMES H. & ROSA ANN COSSETT AND MOVE THE COURT TO ABSTAIN, PENDING THE OUTCOME OF APPEAL TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, TO SEND BINDING INSTRUCTIONS TO THIS COURT AS TO OUR DEMANDS FOR TRIAL BY JURY AND TO PROTECT OUR FLAG FROM HARMS WAY.

/S/

JAMES H. COSSETT

/S/

ROSA ANN COSSETT

ALL RIGHTS DENIED

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON

COSSETT	)	CASE NO. C-3-90-183
PLAINTIFFS	)	Judge Rice
-VS-	)	MOTION TO PROCEED IN
THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY	)	FORM PAUPERIS
DEFENDANTS	)	

NOW COME JAMES H. & ROSA ANN COSSETT AND MOVE THE COURT TO FILE AN APPEAL TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT TO PROTECT OUR AMERICAN FLAG FROM HARMS WAY, AND PROCEED WITH SUCH ACTION IN THE FORM PAUPERIS. DOCKET #47

COSSETT'S WERE SANCTIONED OR FINED $1,211.25 FOR IN GOOD FAITH TRYING TO PROTECT OUR FLAG.

/S/
JAMES H. COSSETT

/S/
ROSA ANN COSSETT

ALL RIGHTS DENIED TO PROTECT OUR FLAG 7/23/91

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON

COSSETTS	)	CASE NO. C-3-90-183
-VS-	)	FILE STAMPED 91-7/10
THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY	)	9:02 A.M.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF

U. S. MAGISTRATE "JUDGE"

MICHAEL R. MERZ

WITHOUT THE"CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED" MAGISTRATE "JUDGE" MERZ, INTERVENED INTO LEGAL ACTION FILED BY THE PLAINTIFFS ON JULY 9,1991. TO RE-OPEN THE FLAG BURNING ISSUE ON THE GROUNDS THAT THE TERM FOR P.L. 98-353 WOULD EXPIRE JULY 10,1991. JUDGE OF THE SECOND REICH SAID "THE PLAINTIFFS ARE AGAIN CAUTIONED AGAINST FILINGS WHICH HAS NO RELATIONSHIP TO THE REAL WORLD"

/S/

MICHAEL R. MERZ "JUDGE"

JULY 10,1991

IN THE SUPREME COURT

OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

TEXAS	)	CASE NO. 88-155
	)	
-VS-	)	DECIDED 20-21,1989
	)	
JOHNSON	)	JUNE FLAG BURNING
	)	
	)	ISSUE

OPINION IN PART

JUSTICE KENNEDY CONCURRING

..."THE OUTCOME CAN BE LAID AT NO DOOR BUT OURS.." .."I DO NOT BELIEVE THE CONSTITUTION GIVES US THE RIGHT TO RULE.." .." FOR ALL THE RECORDS SHOW, THIS RESPONDENT WAS NOT A PHILOSOPHER AND PERHAPS DID NOT POSSESS THE ABILTIY TO COMPREHEND HOW REPELLENT HIS STATEMENT MUST BE TO THE REPUBLIC ITSELF."

CONCURRING WITH JUSTICE

BRENNAN 6-20-21-89

IN THE SUPREME COURT

OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

TEXAS

-VS- MOCK TRIAL

JOHNSON

CASE NO. 88-155

FULL TEXT OF OPINIONS

JUNE 21, 1989

DECIDED

FLAG BURNING ISSUE

OPINION IN PART BY

THE HONORABLE JUSTICE JOHN PAUL STEVENS

DISSENTING

"THE CONTENT OF RESPONDENT'S MESSAGE HAD NO RELEVANCE WHATSOEVER TO THE CASE..."

..."THE COURT IS THEREFORE QUITE WRONG IN BLANDLY ASSERTING THAT THE RESPONDENT WAS PROSECUTED FOR HIS EXPRESSION OF DISSATISFACTION WITH THE POLICIES OF THIS COUNTRY, EXPRESSION SITUATED AT THE CORE OF OUR FIRST AMENDMENT VALUES".

/S/

JOHN PAUL STEVENS

GOD BLESS THIS SUPREME COURT JUSTICE!

I RESPECTFULLY DISSENT

JAMES H & ROSA ANN COSSETT

P.O BOX 191

BOWERSVILLE, OHIO 45307

JULY 23,1991

TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE U.S. SENATE:

WE HAVE JUST CAUSE AND REASON TO BELIEVE THAT CLARENCE THOMAS HAS HELD A SECULAR HUMANIST FORM OF GOV. RELIGIOUS POSITION, ESTABLISHED UNDER P.L. 98-353. WE HAVE TAKEN THE LIBERTY TO FILE A WRIT OF PROHIBITION" IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT. WE HAVE JUST CAUSE TO BELIEVE THAT SAID POSITION WAS ESTABLISHED BY THE BURNING OF OUR AMERICAN FLAG. THEREFORE THE ADVICE AND CONSENT OF THE SENATE SHOULD BE DENIED. U.S. GOVERNMENT CERTIFIED MAIL JULY 23,1991 NO. P-410 057 825.

VICE PRESIDENT QUAYL

/S/

JAMES H. COSSETT

/S/

ROSA ANN COSSETT

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON

COSSETTS	)	CASE NO. C-3-90-183
-VS-	)	JUDGE WALTER RICE
THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY	)	FILE STAMP 8-30-91

ENTRY OVERRULED "OBJECTIONS" TO GOV. RELIGION AND ALL ORDERS CONSTITUTING CONDITIONS OF SERVITUDE..

DOCKET # 58

FREEDOM OF RELIGION IS

OVERRULED & FOR OTHER PURPOSES

UNDER P.L. 98-353

/S/

WALTER HERBERT RICE
U.S. DISTRIC JUDGE

To establish new federal judicial positions as a covert government controlled and burned our American Flag, as an expression of FREEDOM !!! CONSPIRACY.

JAMES H. & ROSA ANN COSSETT

P.O BOX 191

BOWERSVILLE, OHIO 45307

8-27-91

DEAR SENATORS: HAND DELIVERED TO ALL

THE FLAG BURNING ISSUE WAS NOTHING MORE THAN A SHAM, TO TRICK AND TRAP "WE THE PEOPLE" INTO AMENDING OUR "BILL OF RIGHTS" TO USURP SAID RIGHTS FROM THEIR ORIGINAL POSITION OF POWER, ESTABLISHED DEC. 15,1791

ALL WHO VOTED TO AMEND OUR BILL OF RIGHTS ON THE FLAG BURNING ISSUE VOTED THE WRONG WAY !!

IT IS NOW TIME YOU GOT YOUR HEAD ON STRAIGHT AND VOTE WITH "RESPECTING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION" AND NOT FOR THE "NEW IDEA" DEFACTO GOVERNMENT CONTROLLED RELIGION WHOSE MEMBERS BURNED OUR FLAG " TO ESTABLISH NEW FEDERAL JUDICIAL POSITIONS" THAT ARE FOREIGN TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AND OUR FLAG'S SYMBOLIC IDEAS.

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AT NO TIME HAS EVER VESTED JURISDICTION TO THE JUDICIAL BRANCH TO SIEGE POWER OVER " WE THE PEOPLE" AS A RELIGIOUS POWER ; HOWEVER THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY HAS COVERTLY ESTABLISHED ITSELF AS A RELIGIOUS POWER BY THE PASSING OF THE FEDERAL JUDGESHIP

ACT OF 1984 AND AT THE SAME TIME PROPOSITIONAL FUNCTION WITH GREGORY LEE JOHNSON TO BURN OUR AMERICAN FLAG, AS FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS WERE SOLD FOR PROFIT. WE WILL NOT REST UNTIL THIS INJUSTICE IS CORRECTED AND THE FACTS SUBMITTED TO A CANDID WORLD.

/S/

JAMES H. COSSETT

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON

COSSETTS	)	CASE NO C-3-90-183
-VS-	)	JUDGE RICE
THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY	)	FILE STAMP 9-9-91

NOTICE OF APPEAL TO

THE U.S. SUPREME COURT

THE PLAINTIFFS HEREBY GIVE NOTICE THAT WE WILL APPEAL TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT FOR RELIEF FROM THE "NEW IDEA" GOVERNMENTAL RELIGION, OPPRESSION AND CONDITIONS OF SERVITUDE.

DOCKET # 59

FILE STAMPED

RECIEVED SEPT. 13,1991

OFFICE OF THE CLERK SUPREME COURT U.S.

OUR THANKS TO SENATOR METZENBAUM

/S/ /S/

ROSA ANN COSSETT JAMES H. COSSETT

JAMES H. & ROSA ANN COSSETT

P.O. BOX 191

BOWERSVILLE, OHIO 45307

SEPT 10,1991

RE: FREEDOM OF RELIGION, FLAG BURNING & CLARENCE THOMAS.

DEAR SENATOR METZENBAUM:

THE NOMINATION OF CLARENCE THOMAS TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT BY PRESIDENT BUSH IS NOTHING MORE THAN AN EFFORT TO COVER DIRTY TRACKS. BOATH, IN REALITY, ARE FLAG BURNERS WHO, BY FREE EXPRESSION HAVE ESTABLISHED THEMSELFS AS A COVERT GOVERNMENT "NEW IDEA" FORM OF RELIGION UNDER P.L. 98-353, THE FEDERAL JUDGESHIP ACT OF 1984 ESTABLISHED JULY 10,1984 WHILE AT THE SAME TIME THE AMERICAN FLAG WAS BURNED. THE "NEW IDEA" FREE EXERCISE THEREOF FORM OF COVERT GOCERNMENTAL RELIGION IS ENFORCED ONLY BY INTIMIDATION AND THE EXTRA JUDICIAL POWER CIRCUMVENTS THE REQUIREMENTS TO FREEDOM OF RELIGION BY SIMPLY FREE EXERCISE THEREOF DEFACTO ACTING JUDGES ET AL, EXPRESS THEIR "NEW IDEA" SELF-SERVING COVERT GOVERNMENTAL RELIGION, IT HAS LONG BEEN HELD

THAT THERE MUST BE A SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE IN ORDER FOR OUR SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT TO WORK IMPARTIALLY. IN SHORT THE THOMAS NOMINATION IS NOTHING MORE THAN A COVERT MOVE TO CONTINUE TO ESTABLISH THEMSELVES AS A "NEW IDEA" FORM OF GOD, ABUSING THE CORE OF OUR FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS THE SUPREME COURT POSITION MUST NOT BE FILED BY ANYONE WHO WAS APPOINTED TO A JUDICIAL POSITION AFTER JULY 10,1984.

RESPECTFULLY,

/S/
JAMES H. COSSETT

COPY TO PRESIDENT BUSH
JUDGE RICE

IT IS WITH MY HEART FELT THANKS, TO SENATOR METZENBAM FOR FILING THIS LETTER IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT SEPT. 13,1991.

THE U.S. SUPREME

FILE STAMP

JUNE 12,1990

COURT HAS

"NEW PATRIOTISM"

AND

"NO PATRIOTISM"FOR

WE THE PEOPLE'S

GRAND OLD FLAG

NOTICE TAKEN

IN THE FULL TEXT OF OPINIONS BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT DATED 6-20&21,1989 WHEREAS LEGAL ACTION TO CORRECT THIS INJUSTICE HAS BEEN TAKEN WITHIN THE TIME LIMITS OF THE LAW IN THE U.S. FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT AT DAYTON OHIO CASE NO. C-3-90-183.

PUBLIC LAW 98-353 [H.R. 5174] JULY 10,1984

THE FEDERAL JUDGESHIP ACT OF 1984

FOR LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF ACT SEE

THE FULL TEXT OF OPINIONS OF

THE "DESECRATION"OF OUR AMERICAN FLAG

TO ESTABLISH NEW FEDERAL JUDICIAL POSITIONS

AS A SECULAR HUMANIST GOVERNMENT

"NEW IDEA" RELIGION

[TEXAS V JOHNSON]
FLAG BURNING ISSUE

BE IT ENACTED BY THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REP. OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED, THAT THIS ACT MAY BE CITED AS THE BANKRUPTCY AMENDMENT AND THE FEDERAL JUDGESHIP ACT OF 1984. "NEW IDEA" RELIGION THAT RECALLED THE MANDATE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE! WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED.

U.S.C. TITLE 28 § 1334

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT

COURT FOR THE S. DIS. OF OHIO

W. DIV. AT DAYTON

COSSETTS	)	CASE NO. C-3-90-183
	)	
-VS-	)	WAKE UP AMERICA
THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY	)	PROTECT OUR FLAG

OBJECTION TO REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

OF MAGISTRATE MICHAEL R. MERZ ENTIRELY

IN SUITS AT COMMON LAW WERE IT HAS BECOME;

(1) "FRIVOLUS LITIGATION"

(2) SANCTIONS ARE IMPOSED BY THE COURT (SUA SPONTE) FOR VIOLATION AND BELIEVED"

(3) " NO LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE"

(4) "COMPLETELY IRRELEVANT TO THE ISSUE"

(5) "PROHIBITED FROM PLEADING"

(6)"IMPROPER PURPOSES"

(7) "WITHOUT LEGAL OR FACTUAL GROUNDS"

(8)"BE WARNED OF THE CONSEQUENCE"

TO STAND UP AND FIGHT FOR THE AMERICAN FLAG NOT TO BE BURNED.

JAMES H. COSSETT

FLYING THE FLAG IN DISTRESS, ON EVERY JULY 4, COSSETTS WILL FLY OUR AMERICAN FLAG WITH THE UNION DOWN . THE AMERICAN FLAG SHOULD NEVER BE DISPLAYED WITH THE UNION DOWN EXCEPT AS A SIGNAL OF DIRE DISTRESS IN INSTANCES OF EXTREME DANGER TO LIFE OR PROPERTY.

IN ORDER TO TURN OUR FLAG UPRIGHT WE DEMAND THE OVERTURN OF [TEXAS V JOHNSON] AND THE REPEAL OF THE FEDERAL JUDGESHIP ACT OF 1984

SEE PICTURE OF FLAG WITH
THE UNION DOWN
IN ORIGINAL COPY